

To Whom This Concerns at the FCC,
I'm appalled that the National Association of Broadcasters have any say and/or control of any paid radio/tv service, and feel that their accusations are dumbfounded. Satellite radio offers a variety of programming to the consumer unlike commercially broadcasted radio, and should not be controlled by advocates of commercial radio. The same thing applies for cable, & satellite TV versus over the air broadcast TV. A much wider offering of news, sports, movies, etc. are offered via a paid service. Why should XM satellite radio be any different? It's okay for local stations to offer news and traffic information so why is it wrong for XM satellite to be a viable competitor. These commercial station make loads of money through their commercials and contracts with multi-million dollar corporations to play their advertisements. So whats wrong with a paid radio service to offer their customers the convenience of not having to tune into a commercially broadcasted station for traffic, and weather? I am paying for these services so why should I have to tune into a commercial station to wait until the traffic and weather forecasts are announced at the stations convenience? Paid subscription services should allow for these and other benefits not offered by non-paid commercial offerings, to make for even competition. One of the reasons I pay for radio is to have better content and programming that is unavailable through local broadcasters. Program directors limit and control what is played over the air commercially. However with XM satellite radio there are no limits (True freedom of speech through music and other content), unlike conventional broadcast radio. Why should traffic and weather offerings make any difference?